

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and in view of the reasons that follow.

In the specification, paragraphs [0005] and [0031] have been amended.

Claims 15 and 16 are currently being amended.

This amendment adds, changes and/or deletes claims in this application. A detailed listing of all claims that are, or were, in the application, irrespective of whether the claim(s) remain under examination in the application, is presented, with an appropriate defined status identifier.

After amending the claims as set forth above, claims 1-20 remain pending in this application.

Objections to the Disclosure

The disclosure was objected to for certain informalities. Applicant has amended paragraphs [0005] and [0031] to correct minor typographical errors. The objection to the disclosure should now be withdrawn.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claims 16-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as allegedly being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Applicant has amended the preamble of independent claim 16 to recite that the computer program product is “embodied on a computer-readable medium.” Claims 16-20 are now directed to patentable subject matter.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claim 15 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as allegedly being indefinite. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection for at least the following reason.

Paragraph [0034] of the specification describes an embodiment in which multiplexing may be used to “send control-plane messages uncompressed and user-plane messages compressed.” Applicant has amended claim 15 to more clearly recite this feature.

The Examiner argues that claim 15 contradicts claims 1, 7, 12 and 16. Applicant respectfully disagrees. First, claim 15 depends from claim 12. Thus, its relation to claims 1, 7 and 16 is irrelevant. Rather than any contradiction, claim 15 merely recites another embodiment.

Second, contrary to the Examiner’s assertion, claim 15 does not contradict claim 12. Claim 12 recites “an intermediate relay ... that detects and decompresses control messages in messages communicated from the first communication device...” There is no restriction that all messages from the first communication device are compressed. Claim 15 recites another embodiment in which the messages include compressed and uncompressed messages. The uncompressed messages may include control messages. This does not contradict any limitation of independent claim 12.

Accordingly, the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112 should be withdrawn.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-9, 11-13 and 15-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 7,213,143 to Watson et al. (hereinafter “Watson”). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection for at least the following reasons.

Embodiments of the present invention relate to transmission of messages through intermediary relays. The messages may contain control messages and user messages. In one embodiment, the messages are compressed when received by the intermediary relay. Since the control messages are used to establish and authenticate sessions with the relays, they are

decompressed by the relay. While conventional systems either transmitted completely uncompressed messages or required decompression of the entire message, embodiments of the present invention allow decompression of the control message while allowing user messages to pass through without modifications. Independent claims 1, 7, 12 and 16 each recite this aspect of the present invention.

Watson fails to teach or suggest this feature of the present invention. Watson discloses transmission of messages from a first end terminal (UA1) to a second end terminal (UA2) through a security proxy. The entire message is compressed by UA1 for transmission. The security proxy receives and decrypts the message and then decompresses the entire message. See Watson, col. 7, line 61 – col. 8, line 1. There is no teaching or suggestion in Watson of decompressing the control message and allowing the user message to pass through without modifications. It is clear from the disclosure of Watson that the entire message, including the user message, is decompressed by the security proxy.

The Examiner cites Watson as disclosing passing user messages through the intermediary without modification at col. 1, lines 40-43. Applicant respectfully disagrees with this interpretation of the disclosure of Watson.

The cited portion of Watson relates to a conventional message formats and their transmission. In this light, the cited portion details that “[m]essage bodies carry information end-to-end between multimedia devices, e.g. session parameters.” There is no teaching or suggestion whatsoever in this portion of Watson of the state of the messages, whether compressed or uncompressed. The cited portion merely details that the messages are sent from one end to another. There is no teaching or suggestion of decompressing the control message while allowing user messages to pass through without modification.

Accordingly, independent claims 1, 7, 12 and 16 are patentable. Claims 2-6 depend, either directly or indirectly, from allowable claim 1 and are, therefore, patentable for at least that reason, as well as for additional patentable features when those claims are considered as a whole.

Similarly, claims 8, 9 and 11 depend from allowable claim 7; claims 13 and 15 depend from allowable claim 12; and claims 17-20 depend from allowable claim 16. Therefore, claims 8, 9, 11, 13, 15 and 17-20 are patentable for at least that reason, as well as for additional patentable features when those claims are considered as a whole.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 10 and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Watson in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,421,734 to Nessett et al. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection for at least the following reasons.

Claim 10 depends directly from allowable claim 7 and is, therefore, patentable for at least that reason, as well as for additional patentable features when that claim is considered as a whole. Similarly, claim 14 depends directly from allowable claim 12 and is, therefore, patentable for at least that reason, as well as for additional patentable features when that claim is considered as a whole.

Applicant believes that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check or credit card payment form being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicant hereby petitions for such extension under 37

C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: October 25, 2007

By /G. Peter Albert Jr./

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP
Customer Number: 30542
Telephone: (858) 847-6735
Facsimile: (858) 792-6773

G. Peter Albert Jr.
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 37,268